

BEST AVAILABLE COPY**Remarks/Arguments**

The final Office Action dated May 12, 2005, and the documents applied therein have been carefully reviewed, and in view of the above changes and following remarks reconsideration and allowance of all the claims pending in the application are respectfully requested.

The Amendments To The Claims

Applicants have amended the claims to generally improve their form in accordance with U.S. patent law and to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the applied art.

More specifically, Applicants have amended claims 1, 20, 27, 33 and 45 to clearly identify the corresponding claimed invention as a method.

Applicants have also amended claims 1, 20, 27, 33, 48, 49, 53 and 54 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the applied art. In particular, claims 1, 20, 49 and 53 have been amended to require the concept that the claimed key elements are recognized based on key elements contained in a key-element list. Claims 27, 48 and 54 have been similarly amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, figures and claims, for example on page 18, line 4, through page 21, line 9; Figures 4 and 5; and original claim 53.

Applicants have amended claims 29, 45 and 52 to generally improve their respective forms in accordance with U.S. patent law.

Lastly, Applicants have added new claim 60, which is based on limitations contained in originally filed claim 1.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Additionally, claims 2-19 stand rejected for indefiniteness because the Examiner asserts there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the method" in the claims.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 20, 27, 33 and 45 to better identify the corresponding claimed invention as a method.

In particular, the preamble of each of independent claims 1, 20, 22, 27, 33 and 45 states that the claimed invention is a method. Moreover, each of dependent claims 2-19, which

Page 12 - REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 12, 2005
Serial No. 09/881,353

depend on claim 1, include language in the preamble stating the claimed invention of each of claims 2-19 is a method. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 2-19 has sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the method."

Further, claim 21, which depends on claim 20, has a preamble that states the claimed invention of claim 21 is a method. Further still, claims 22-26, which depend on claim 22, each have a preamble that states the corresponding claimed invention is a method. In a similar manner, each of claims 28-32, which depend on claim 27, each have a preamble that states the corresponding claimed invention is a method. Each of claims 34-44, which depend on claim 33, states that the corresponding claimed invention is a method. Each of claims 46 and 47, which depend on claim 45, states that the corresponding claimed invention is a method.

Regarding claim 48, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 48 is directed to a computer code having certain required limitations.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that each of claims 1-48 is definite by particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter Applicants regard as the invention as either a method or a computer code. Further, each of claims 2-19 has sufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the method."

Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Amazon

Claims 1-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by www.amazon.com; archived any linkage; October 19, 1999, hereinafter referred to as Amazon.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 20, 27, 33, 48, 49, 53 and 54 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the applied art. Applicants have also amended claims 29, 45 and 52 to generally improve their respective forms in accordance with U.S. patent law. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention according to any of claims 1-59.

As to each of claims 1, 20, 22, 27, 33, 45, 48, 49, 53 and 54, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not presented a prima facie case that Amazon anticipates the present invention. The Examiner merely states "Amazon teaches a website system and method for searching key words where in [sic] the system; identifies the items and returns results related to items to the client.(Pg. 12 "search")." Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's

general assertion does not point out with any specificity how Amazon anticipates the present invention according to any of claims 1, 20, 22, 27, 33, 45, 48, 49, 53 and 54.

For example, regarding claim 1, the Examiner has not identified embedding of code in an electronic content document that is retrievable from a content provider computer system storing content documents, such that the code is executable by a client computer to invoke the central computer system to recognize key elements based on key elements contained in a key-element list, as required by claim 1. Additionally regarding claim 1, the Examiner has not identified "recognizing key elements in the document based on the key elements in the key-element list." Lastly regarding claim 1, the Examiner has not identified "generating annotation instructions for the client computer system to create one or more annotations for one or more key elements in the content document and sending the instructions to the client computer system." Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has similarly not specifically identified the corresponding limitations of any of claims 20, 22, 27, 33, 45, 48, 49, 53 and 54.

Considering claim 1 in greater detail, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest embedding code in an electronic content document that is retrievable from a content provider computer system that stores content documents such that the embedded code is executable by a client computer to invoke the central computer system to recognize key elements based on key elements contained in a key-element list. At best, Amazon discloses an electronic content document in the form of a web page that includes embedded code in the form of conventional hyperlinks. While the Examiner asserts that a hyperlink instructs a web browser to go to a new web location (see final Office Action dated May 12, 2005, page 5, lines 8-13), Applicants respectfully submit that the conventional hyperlinks to which the Examiner refers are not the claimed key elements that are based on key elements contained in a key-element list as required by claim 1. In particular, the conventional hyperlinks to which the Examiner refers notably lack a corresponding key-element list and, consequently, none of the Amazon conventional hyperlinks can be a claimed key element. Moreover, the "key elements" to which the Examiner "points" (see final Office Action dated May 12, 2005, page 5, lines 12-13) are nothing more than conventional hyperlinks and are not the claimed key elements that are contained in a key-element list, as required by claim 1.

While Applicants agree that the Examiner is required to read the claims in the broadest reasonable sense, Applicants respectfully submit that it is unreasonable to read any of the pending claims in a manner that interprets the claimed key elements and key-element list as a

Page 14 - REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 12, 2005
Serial No. 09/881,353

conventional hyperlink because it is contrary to the well-accepted meaning of the term "hyperlink". Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that as the Examiner reads the claims in the broadest reasonable sense, the Examiner cannot disregard the meaning that a person skilled in the art would give to the terms appearing in each of the present claims.

Continuing with claim 1, Amazon does not disclose or suggest recognizing key elements in the document based on the key elements in the claimed key-element list. As demonstrated above, the Amazon web page only includes embedded code in the form of conventional hyperlinks. Because each hyperlink is conventional, the Amazon web page does not recognize key elements that are contained in a key-element list, as required by claim 1.

Further still, because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key elements, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest generating annotation instructions for the client computer system to create one or more annotations for one or more key elements in the content document and sending the instructions to the client computer system as required by claim 1.

Thus, claim 1 is allowable over Amazon. It follows that claims 2-19, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 1, are each allowable over Amazon for at least the same reason that claim 1 is considered allowable.

Each of claims 2-4 are allowable for the additional reason that Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed code that is embedded in the content document as required by each of claims 2-4.

Claim 5 is allowable for the additional reason that Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed annotation for a key element; consequently, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed annotation for a key element is associated with data ("key element data") that is suitable for forming a query for use by a search engine to locate information related to the key element. While the Examiner asserts that page 12 of "Amazon teaches product categories used to browse", Applicant respectfully submits that page 12 of Amazon discloses only that the area called "Browse" contains a list of product categories that can be explored and does not disclose an annotation for a key element that is suitable for forming a query for use by a search engine to locate information related to a key element.

Claims 6-11, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 5, are each allowable for at least the additional reason that claim 5 is considered allowable.

Claim 12 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element data, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that claimed key

Page 15 - REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 12, 2005
Serial No. 09/881,353

element data is associated with an annotation that corresponds to a URL for a static document that is available over the Internet.

Claim 13 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed annotation, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that following a user's selection of the claimed annotation, key element data is sent to a remote computer system and the remote computer system uses the data to dynamically generate data comprising a data object for sending to the client computer system.

Claims 14 and 15, which both incorporate the limitations of claim 13, are each allowable for at least the additional reason that claim 13 is considered allowable.

Claim 16 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key elements, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the recognizing of the claimed key elements occurs on the claimed central computer system.

Claim 17 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed annotation instructions, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed annotation instructions are generated on the central computer system.

Claim 18 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed annotation instructions, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed annotation instructions direct the creation of a hyperlink in association with a key element.

Claim 19 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed annotation instructions, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed annotation instructions direct the creation of a pop-up window with links to information related to a key element recognized by the recognizer.

Regarding claim 20, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest receiving on a first computer system a web page over a packet-switched network such that the web page corresponds to a web page presented to a user of a second computer system, and recognizing in the web page on the first computer system one or more predetermined key elements based on a key-element list such that the key element list comprises one or more words relating to one or more products. Instead, Amazon discloses a web page that includes conventional hyperlinks that is presented to a user of a computer corresponding to the claimed second computer. The Amazon web page is not received by a

computer corresponding to the claimed first computer. Moreover, Amazon does not disclose the claimed key element or the claimed key-element list.

Thus, claim 20 is allowable over Amazon. It follows that claim 21, which incorporates the limitations of claim 20, is allowable over Amazon for at least the same reasons that claim 20 is considered allowable.

Regarding claim 22, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key list; consequently Amazon cannot disclose or suggest sending the claimed key list from a remote computer system to a client computer system such that the claimed key list comprises a set of key elements and corresponding identifiers; and such that the claimed key list is adapted for the client computer to use in performing on an electronic document presented to a user of the computer system from a content provider computer system one or more of (i) recognizing key elements and (ii) annotating key elements. Moreover, Amazon does not disclose or suggest that the client computer has the claimed executable code for performing one or both of annotation and recognition of key elements on the key list. As demonstrated above, Amazon discloses a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks and that each conventional hyperlink in an Amazon web page is not based on a key element contained in a key-element list, as required by claim 22.

Thus, claim 22 is allowable over Amazon. It follows that each of claims 23-26, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 22, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 22 is considered allowable.

Claim 23 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed executable code or the claimed key elements, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed code includes means for key elements to be associated with a hyperlink to information related to a key element on the electronic document.

Claim 24 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed executable code or the claimed key elements, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed code includes means for key elements to be associated with a pop-up window displaying at least one link to information related to a key element on the electronic document.

Regarding claim 27, Applicant respectfully submits that Amazon does not disclose or suggest that on a first computer system, an electronic document with at least one claimed predetermined key element is received, and that from a second computer system, the identity of

Page 17 - REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 12, 2005
Serial No. 09/881,353

the electronic document that is received on the first computer system is known, and instructions are sent to the first computer system for presenting to a user of the first computer system one or more hyperlinks related to a key element on the electronic document so the user may retrieve data or information related to the key element, such that the claimed key element is contained in a key-element list. At best Amazon discloses a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks. Moreover, each conventional hyperlink in an Amazon web page is not based on a key element contained in a key-element list, as required by claim 27.

Thus, claim 27 is allowable over Amazon. It follows that claims 28-32, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 27, are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 27 is considered allowable.

Claim 28 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the instructions to the first computer system are usable by that system to annotate the electronic document with data corresponding to an identifier for the claimed key element.

Claim 29 is allowable for the additional reason that Amazon does not disclose or suggest that the electronic document includes code executable by the second computer system to generate annotation instructions that are sent to the first computer system for use in generating the hyperlink. As demonstrated above, Amazon discloses a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks and does not generate the claimed annotation instructions.

Claim 30, which incorporates the limitations of claim 29, is allowable for at the same reasons that claim 29 is considered allowable. Claim 30 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed annotation instructions, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that when the electronic document is a web page, and prior to being received by the first computer system, a code executable by the first computer system is embedded in the web page such that the code is capable of invoking the second computer to generate the claimed annotation instructions for the first computer system.

Claim 31, which incorporates the limitations of claim 30, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 30 is considered allowable. Claim 31 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed code, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed code is executable by the second computer to retrieve a web page corresponding to the one received on the first computer system, such that the second computer recognizes predetermined key elements on the web page and sends annotation

Page 18 - REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 12, 2005
Serial No. 09/881,353

instructions to the first computer system for annotation of the web page on the first computer system.

Regarding claim 33, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest providing a second computer system from a first computer system a set of predetermined key elements and corresponding identifiers for use in creating annotations for key elements on an electronic document. Amazon discloses only a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks. Moreover, Amazon does not disclose or suggest receiving from the second computer system data associated with a claimed annotation for a key element ("key element data") following selection of an annotation by a user of the second computer system. Amazon discloses only conventional hyperlinks and does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element. Further, because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest retrieving or generating data or information responsive to the claimed key element data received from the second computer system. Lastly regarding claim 33, Amazon does not disclose or suggest sending the information to a computer system or output device associated with the user selecting the claimed annotation.

Thus, claim 33 is allowable over Amazon. It follows that claims 34-44, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 33, are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 33 is considered allowable.

Claim 34 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element data, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed key element data is suitable for forming a query for use by a search engine to locate information related to the key element, and that the claimed key element data is transferred over a packet-switched network to another computer system.

Claim 35, which incorporates the limitations of claim 34, is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the information relates to products relating to the claimed key element.

Claim 36, which incorporates the limitations of claim 35, is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element data or the claimed annotation, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest using the claimed key element data to formulate a query in a database coupled to the other computer system and sending product-related information generated from the query to the user selecting the claimed annotation.

Page 19 - REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 12, 2005
Serial No. 09/881,353

Claims 37-40, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 36, are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 36 is considered allowable.

Claim 41 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element data, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the key element data comprises the URL for a static document available over the Internet.

Claim 42 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element data, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the key element data is used to dynamically generate data comprising a data object for sending to the second computer system.

Claims 43 and 44, which incorporate the limitations of claim 42, are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 42 is considered allowable.

Regarding claim 45, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest transmitting to a second computer system from a first central computer system a consumer code executable on the consumer computer system for (i) recognizing predetermined key elements on an electronic document and (ii) annotating the claimed key elements by associating recognized key elements with a URL for a second computer system computer system such that the address is determinable from a key list comprising a set of key elements and corresponding identifiers. Amazon discloses a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks and does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element or the claimed key list, as required by claim 45.

Thus, claim 45 is allowable over Amazon. It follows that claims 46 and 47, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 45, are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 45 is considered allowable.

Claim 46 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key elements, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the code is executable to recognize and annotate key elements on a web page received from a content provider computer system.

Claim 47 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key elements, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that one or more key elements comprise one or more words.

Regarding claim 48, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed computer code stored in memory on a central computer system and

executable thereon such that the claimed code is invocable on the central computer system by a client computer system to generate annotation instructions for the client computer system to associate annotations with key elements on an electronic page received by the client computer system from a content provider computer system and such that the key elements are contained in a key element list. Amazon discloses a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks and does not disclose or suggest the claimed key elements or the claimed key element list, as required by claim 48.

Thus, claim 48 is allowable over Amazon.

Regarding claim 49, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed computer code stored in memory on a first computer system comprising the computer of a consumer and executable thereon such that the code is adapted to (i) recognize predetermined key elements on an electronic document received from a content provider computer system such that the predetermined key elements are contained in a set of key elements, and (ii) create an annotation for a key element by associating recognized key elements with an identifier corresponding to the address of a second computer system and such that the identifier is determined from the set of key elements and corresponding identifiers stored on the first computer system. Amazon discloses a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks and does not disclose or suggest the claimed predetermined key elements or the claimed set of key elements, as required by claim 49.

Thus, claim 49 is allowable over Amazon. It follows that claims 50-52, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 49, are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 49 is considered allowable.

Claim 50 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key list comprising the set of key elements and identifiers, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed the code is adapted to recognize and annotate an electronic document comprising a web page received by the first computer system from a content provider over a packet switched network and that the code uses the claimed key list comprising the set of key elements and identifiers such that the identifiers corresponding to one or more URLs.

Claim 51, which incorporates the limitations of claim 50, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 50 is considered allowable. Claim 51 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key list, Amazon cannot

Page 21 - REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 12, 2005
Serial No. 09/881,353

disclose or suggest that the claimed code is adapted to retrieve a key list from a remote computer system.

Claim 52, which incorporates the limitations of claim 51, is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 51 is considered allowable. Claim 52 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key list, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the claimed code is adapted to retrieve the claimed key list from a remote computer system.

Regarding claim 53, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key list stored on the system comprising a set of key elements and corresponding identifiers that correspond to addresses for electronic information or data that are relevant to a key element. As demonstrated above, Amazon, at best, discloses a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks and nothing regarding the claimed key list. Further, because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key list, Amazon cannot not disclose or suggest the claimed recognizer module stored on the system for parsing a page received from the content provider computer system and identifying on the electronic page one or more listed key elements matching to predetermined key elements in the claimed stored key list. Lastly, regarding claim 53, because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key list, Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed annotation module stored on the system for associating identified key elements with an annotation from the claimed key list so that a user presented the electronic page can retrieve information related to the key element by selecting annotation.

Thus, claim 53 is allowable over Amazon.

Regarding claim 54, Applicants respectfully submit that Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed web document stored in memory on a server such that the web document contains code executable by a client computer system enabling the client computer to invoke a remote computer system to generate annotation instructions that are returned to the client computer system, with each annotation instruction corresponding to a key element contained in a key element list and such that the annotation instructions are used by the client computer system to create an annotation for a predetermined key element on the web document. As demonstrated above, Amazon, at best, discloses a web page that only includes conventional hyperlinks and nothing regarding the claimed key element or the claimed key list.

Thus, claim 54 is allowable over Amazon. It follows that claims 55-59, which each incorporate the limitations of claim 54, are each allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 54 is considered allowable.

Claim 55 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key element, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the key element comprises one or more words.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and allow claims 1-59.

Newly Added Claim

Applicants have added new claim 60. Support for new claim 60 can be found throughout the specification and claim, for example, in originally filed claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 60 is allowable over Amazon for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is considered allowable. Claim 60 is allowable for the additional reason that because Amazon does not disclose or suggest the claimed key elements, Amazon cannot disclose or suggest that the central computer system recognizes key elements on a document corresponding to the content document.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow new claim 60.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and arguments, It is urged that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.


Applicant has attached a Credit Card Payment Form (PTO-2038) to cover the fee for a one-month extension of time calculated from the Notice of Appeal filed August 11, 2005. If, for any reason, that Form is ineffective, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees (including all required extension of time fees and the fees for the Terminal Disclaimer), additional fees, or underpayments, or to credit any overpayments, to the undersigned attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-1001.

A general authorization under 37 C.F.R. § 1.25(b), second sentence, is hereby given to credit or debit Deposit Account No. 50-1001 for the instant filing and for any other fees during the pendency of this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.18.

It is requested that this application be passed to issue with claims 1-60.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 3, 2005



Joseph P. Curtin
Registration No. 34,571
P. O. Box 2200
Hillsboro, Oregon 97123
Telephone: (503) 844-9009
Facsimile: (503) 296-2172
email: mail@ganzlaw.com

Page 24 - REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED MAY 12, 2005
Serial No. 09/881,353

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.